



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,798	02/04/2004	Terrell B. Jones	043474/258903	3348
826	7590	07/10/2008		
ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA 101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000 CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			EXAMINER NGUYEN, CUONG H	
			ART UNIT 3661	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/10/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/771,798

**Applicant(s)**

JONES ET AL.

**Examiner**

CUONG H. NGUYEN

**Art Unit**

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/28/08 (the amendment).
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This Office Action is the answer to the amendment filed on 2/28/2008.
2. Claims 1-40 are pending; and new claims 41-43 are added.

***Specification Objection***

3A. The examiner fails to see that the original specification discloses about "...but not a destination location..." as in amended claims 14, 22, and 41-43; therefore, there is no concentered support for this claimed limitation in the disclosure.

***Response to Arguments***

3B. The examiner also maintains previous cited prior art because they are amended with similar subject matter with previous pending claims – previous examiner's arguments/remarks are again applied because there is nothing inventive from pending claims – in pending independent claims, the applicants only claim about:

- receiving queries from a user (e.g., information about travel: from where to where);
- processing said queries using a server (e.g., going from LA to Washington DC, may have to stop at Chicago depending on available airlines before continuing that trip);
- display/transmit a map to that user including information about a pair of airports, and associated airfare.

Note that additional information (which is already available from an airline i.e., a pair of airport, and associated airfare are already available information – the only thing requires is to put that information on a map; therefore, what applicants claim are not inventive.

The applicants argue that examiner uses non-analogous art; the examiner submits that these cited art suggest very fundamental/basic steps/tools in everyday's application for travel planning to one with skill in the art.

Art Unit: 3661

A. For broad claims 14, and 22: A rejection on 35 USC 103(a) is applied since these pending claims describe obvious limitations already suggested by Dawson et al. (US Pat. 4,876,651).

B. As to claims 1, and 7; a phrase of: “at least one pair of airports” represents a well-known destination and arrival points; and “associated airfare”, are necessary information for a trip – they are not new.

C. As to amended claim 7, Applicants argue that Bellesfield et al. do not teach a solution set including an Airport – this is merely any term that means “a destination”/a location (such as an airport); a distance between 2 airports/locations is merely any “travel” distance (a distance/travel time is already taken into account); and a fare is merely a fee/cost for traveling between 2 places (not necessary an airfare; e.g., these claimed information have been disclosed in any travel plan/package as “extra information”). The current examiner respectfully submits that claimed “a solution set” comprises those information (knowing that these pending claims are merely directed to displaying information electronically, such as on a computer screen that are widely being used) – merely a different way of expressing a depart, and a destination points.

D. Bellesfield et al. suggest about displaying “a solution set” with a destination and/or point of interest (e.g., between a departure place and a destination place – such as airports) to distribute a travel plan/package (see also DeLorme et al., the abstract). A user selects, via the user interface (i.e., a Windows.TM. from Microsoft on a computer screen), a departure point and a destination point, the routing component employs the routing database to generate and display a route between the selected departure and destination points. Based on selected criteria by a user (i.e., destination/airport), a

Art Unit: 3661

package/solution set which is a travel route generated by Bellesfield includes the airport, which is the destination and/or point of interest. Using Bellesfield's invention, and entering as a destination (a city/an airport) would provide a route to requested destination/airport/city, which is "a solution set" – this is merely an answer on computer screen after searching. One of ordinary skilled in the art use cited inventions to enter/input an airport as a destination city to obtain an automated travel planning from the starting/departure point to a destination, including corresponding distances, and related costs as extra necessary information in travels – those information are well-known.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC 112**

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 14, 22, and 41-43 are rejected on first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 since the examiner fails to see that the original specification discloses about "...but not a destination location..." as in amended claims 14, 22, and 41-43; therefore, there is no concreted support in the disclosure.
5. Dependent claims 15-21, and 23-25 are rejected on that basis because they incorporate that deficiency from their parent claims.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all Obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 14, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al. (US Pat. 4,876,651).

A. As to independent claim 14. A method for providing travel information, comprising:

- receiving a request including a departure location (i.e., inputting data to a digital mapping display system, see Dawson et al., the summary of the invention);
- generating a map including a set of points corresponding to the departure location and any airports having carrier service from the departure location to another location (see Dawson set al., col.1 lines 42-67); and
- transmitting the generated map (i.e., send/transfer data/information related to a map, see Dawson et al., col. 2 lines 39-43, and col. 15 lines 1-4).

Dawson et al. do not disclose about “but not a destination location”; however, the examiner submits that from other user’s input criteria, and that user selection of available travel’s legs on screen – a destination must be selected after all, whether that information come from a display, or is made by a user from display information on screen – a user can make selections in his/her head of travel legs from displayed information is not new.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to include a pair of airports in Dawson to answer normal questions of WHAT? WHERE? in Internet searching in order to get a travel plan and using selected one as a destination/point of interest (even if he/she has not select a direct flight); for the advantage of using available database in servers for remote accessibility, and for flexible selection as desired with available schedule/plans.

B. As to independent claim 22. A method for a user to obtain travel information,

comprising:

- entering a request including a departure location; and
- receiving a map generated to include a set of points corresponding to the departure location and any airports having carrier service from the departure location to another location.

This claim has all limitations of rejected claim 14 above; it is rejected with the same rationales and reference.

7. Claims 1, 7-9, 16, 17, 23-24, 27-28, 32-39 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al. (US Pat. 4,876,651), in view of Bellesfield et al. (US Pat. 6,498,982), further in view of DeLorme et al. (US Pat. 5,948,040).

The rationales and reference for rejection of claims 14, and 22 are incorporated.

A. As per claims 1, 7-9, and 32-38, Bellesfield et al. further suggest steps/components of:

- receiving/providing a specific information request according to a user (e.g., a user inputs/enters travel information - see Bellesfield et al., Figs. 1, 2, 9, 10 and 11);
- processing information request to initiate an inquiry, and collecting responses from a server, which gathers information from a remote server, to determine a solution set to the information request (e.g., USER INTERFACE 14 sends inputs to box 38 to process (box 26, 30, and 34) can be remote servers; obtained solutions are displayed on MONITOR 18 – see Bellesfield et al., Fig. 2);

Art Unit: 3661

- rendering that “solution set” in an electronic map for transmission to a user (e.g., a link to a map, see Bellesfield et al., Fig. 2 – displaying MAP SELECTION 42, ROUTING 46: a travel distance for fee calculation, and PLACES OF INTEREST 34 – such as airport locations);

Bellesfield does not explicitly disclose that “solution set” including an airport/city, a travel fee, and a traveling distance.

However, DeLorme suggests that travel “solution set”/package (see DeLorme, the abstract – according DeLorme’s invention: WHERE? – airport/city/point-of-interest, WHAT? - airplane, WHEN? and HOW? and time and cost of that corresponding travel).

In claims 32-33, 35-36, 38-39 the applicants claim a feature of many “HITS” can be obtained while searching (e.g., on the Internet), these are just extra related information that one can get from a claimed step of obtaining info. (e.g., extra airports/departure places/destination places, and corresponding airfares).

In claims 34, 37, and 40 searching for a range/(money to spend) while looking for a service/a product/an item has been well-known; a computer also understands that a given amount is the same as a maximum amount – this computer’s understanding read-on what the applicants claim.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to include a pair of airports in Dawson to Bellesfield's and DeLorme’s suggestions to answer normal questions of WHAT? WHERE? in Internet searching in order to get a travel plan and using selected one as a destination/point of interest; for the advantage of linking different digital computers with database in servers via a modem for remote accessibility, and for flexible selection as desired (this output of that process may be a



Art Unit: 3661

map/ticket combination with machine readable encoded ticket and reservation information. The output may also include travel materials such as airline tickets, POI displays, hotels, restaurant coupons, and tickets. The process also accomplishes linking and electronic data transfer between involved digital computers, a PDA, or a GPS receiver).

B. As per claims 2, and 10, Bellesfield et al. further teach about receiving travel data from one server for use on a computer system (see Bellesfield et al., Fig. 2 refs. 26, 30, and 34; col.5 lines 1-9).

C. As per claims 3, and 11, Bellesfield et al. further teach that a user select a topic to input requests (see Bellesfield et al., Figs.2 where a user input a MAP SELECTION 42 for display on MONITOR 18).

D. As per claims 4, and 12, Bellesfield et al. further teach about parsing inquiries for querying from data tables (see Bellesfield et al., Figs. 3, 5 and 7).

E. As per claim 6, Bellesfield et al. further teach about providing results (i.e., an electronic map) to a requested user that posed the information request (see Bellesfield et al., Fig. 10 ref. 146 and Fig.11 ref. 160).

F. As per claims 5 and 13, Bellesfield et al. further suggest that requested information may be supplied from a provider (see Bellesfield et al., Fig. 2 refs. 26, 28, and 34 are provided by external database from another provider).

G. As per claims 15, 25 and 26, Bellesfield et al. further teach the request including a location of interest, and a distance to the location of interest (see Bellesfield et al., Fig. 2 refs. 26, 28, and 34 provide a PLACE OF INTEREST and ROUTING DATABASE containing corresponding distances; and the abstract).

H. As per claim 18, 20, 29 and 31, Bellesfield et al. do not explicitly disclose that accessing a database for a geocode corresponding to a destination of interest.

However, they disclose that a geocode of a related point of interest can be obtained with corresponding latitude and longitude coordinates (see Bellesfield et al., Fig. 7).

I. As per claims 19 and 30, Bellesfield et al. further teach about accessing a database for a distance between 2 points and an associating traveled fair, (see Bellesfield et al., Fig. 2, the routing component 46 accesses routing database 30 for a distance and estimating an associating fair including an available lowest fair).

J. As per claim 21, Bellesfield et al. further suggest about storing the retrieved information in a searchable database (see Bellesfield et al., col. 6 lines 52-67 – related information are organized together in a database structure and are storing in a convenient location for further use).

K. As per newly added claims 41-43: The examiner submits that the applicants claim a step similar as in rejected claim 14 – therefore, same rationale, and reference are incorporated.

8. Claims 16, 17, 23, 24, 27, and 28, 34, 37, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al. (US Pat. 4,876,651), in view of Bellesfield et al. (US Pat. 6,498,982), further in view of DeLorme et al. (US Pat. 5,948,040).

The rationales and reference for rejection of claims 14, and 22 are incorporated.

Bellesfield et al. do not explicitly disclose about a dollar limit/maximum airfare as a feature of requested information.

However, DeLorme suggests that travel “solution set”/package (see DeLorme, the abstract – according DeLorme’s invention: WHERE? – airport/city/point-of-interest, WHAT? - airplane, WHEN? and HOW? are time and maximum cost of that corresponding travel – this max. cost includes a max. airfare).

Furthermore, DeLorme teaches a user buying tickets (see DeLorme et al., col. 14, lines 25-30 – viewing/purchasing tickets online for a trip, that shows a maximum amount of airfare).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine Dawson, Bellesfield's invention and DeLorme’s invention to explicitly disclose about a dollar limit/a maximum airfare as a feature of requested information for the advantage of constructing a travel package including travel distance costs requested by a user.

Bellesfield do not explicitly disclose a request having a number of travelers.

However, DeLorme et al. suggest about making reservations and buying various tickets – including a task of specifying how many travelers in that trip for a cost calculation.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine Dawson, Bellesfield and DeLorme’s inventions to explicitly disclose a request having a number of travelers as a feature of travel cost calculation for the advantage of constructing a travel package including total travel costs requested by a user.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Claims 1-43 are not patentable, and the arguments on amended claims are not persuasive; accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CUONG H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-6759 (email address: cuong.nguyen@uspto.gov). The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, THOMAS G. BLACK can be reached on 571-272-6956. The Rightfax number for the organization where this application is assigned is 571-273-6759.

Art Unit: 3661

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Please provide support, with page and line numbers, for any amended or new claim in an effort to help advance prosecution; otherwise any new claim language that is introduced in an amended or new claim may be considered as new matter, especially if the Application is a Jumbo Application.

/CUONG H. NGUYEN/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3661